	9 2 3 2 2
	Page 1
1	UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
2	SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
3	
4	x
5	In the Matter of:
6	
7	MOTORS LIQUIDATION COMPANY, Case No. 09-50026(REG)
8	
9	Debtor.
10	x
11	
12	U.S. Bankruptcy Court
13	One Bowling Green
14	New York, New York
15	
16	July 1, 2015
17	10:19 AM
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	BEFORE:
24	HON ROBERT E. GERBER
25	U.S. BANKRUPTCY JUDGE

Page 2 Hearing re: Motion Filed by Wilmington Trust Company, as GUC Trust Administrator and Trustee, for an Order Granting Authority (A) to Exercise New GM Warrants and Liquidate New GM Common Stock, and (B) to Make Corresponding Amendments to The GUC Trust Agreement Transcribed by: Dawn South

		Page 3			
1	APPEARANCES:				
2	GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP				
3		Attorneys for the GUC Trust Administrator			
4		200 Park Avenue			
5		New York, NY 10166-0193			
6					
7	BY:	KEITH R. MARTORANA, ESQ.			
8		LISA RUBIN, ESQ.			
9					
10	BROWN RUDNICK				
11		Attorneys for Ignition Switch Plaintiffs and Certain			
12		Non-Ignition Switch Plaintiffs			
13		Seven Times Square			
14		New York, NY 10036			
15					
16	BY:	HOWARD S. STEEL, ESQ.			
17		EDWARD S. WEISFELNER, ESQ.			
18					
19	GOODWIN PROCTER LLP				
20		Attorney for the Plaintiffs			
21		The New York Times Building			
22		620 Eighth Avenue			
23		New York, NY 10018-1405			
24					
25	BY:	WILLIAM P. WEINTRAUB, ESQ.			

		Page 4
1	AKIN	GUMP STRAUSS HAUER & FELD LLP
2		Attorneys for Participating Unitholders
3		One Bryant Park
4		New York, NY 10036-6745
5		
6	BY:	DEBORAH NEWMAN, ESQ.
7		NAOMI MOSS, ESQ.
8		
9		
10	KING	& SPALDING
11		Attorney for New GM
12		1185 Avenue of the Americas
13		New York, NY 10036-4003
14		
15	BY:	ARTHUR J. STEINBERG, ESQ.
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

Pg 5 of 22 Page 5 1 PROCEEDINGS 2 THE COURT: GM Motors Liquidation. 3 MR. MARTORANA: Good morning, Your Honor, Keith Martorana of Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher on behalf of Motors 4 5 Liquidation Company GUC Trust. 6 THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Martorana, I know others 7 had filed objections which may have been withdrawn. 8 Mr. Shaw in the courtroom? I don't see him. Okay. And of 9 course there were files by Mr. Weisfelner and Mr. Weintraub. 10 But I gather, Mr. Martorana, that the issues have been 11 narrowed or elongated in some respects? 12 MR. MARTORANA: Yes, that is correct, Your Honor. 13 As you noted with respect to Dr. Shaw we are 14 prepared to go forward. That issue has not been resolved. 15 With respect to the responses that are filed by 16 the ignition switch plaintiffs, uncertain non-ignition 17 switch plaintiffs, as well as the joinder that was filed by 18 the pre-closing accident plaintiffs, where we have come out 19 is the following. 20 The plaintiffs -- both sets of plaintiffs withdraw 21 any objection to the relief that the GUC Trust is seeking 22 today, which is the motion to sell the securities and convert them into cash. 23 24 The affirmative relief sought by the plaintiffs,

which is the stay of any future GUC Trust distributions

Page 6 1 pending the appeal, has been adjourned. 2 We had initially spoken to your chambers and I believe we got July 30th at 9:45, but I understand and I'll 3 4 let others speak, I understand there may be a request to move that to the following week if your chambers -- if that 5 6 works for Your Honor. 7 And then in the interim the parties plan to work on a potential global resolution to the plaintiffs' issues 8 9 with respect to the GUC Trust assets, not involving 10 necessarily New General Motors, this is currently -- we're 11 talking about potential framework for a global resolution 12 between plaintiffs and the GUC Trust. 13 I'll pause there to see if anyone has anything 14 else to say. 15 THE COURT: Okay. 16 MR. STEEL: Good morning, Your Honor, Howard 17 Steel, Brown Rudnick, designated counsel to the ignition 18 switch plaintiffs and certain non-ignition switch plaintiffs. 19 20 Your Honor, we don't disagree with Mr. Martorana's 21 recap. I think it goes without saying during the 22 intervening period the GUC Trust (indiscernible) agreed that no distributions will be made of GUC Trust assets. 23 24 MR. MARTORANA: That's correct, Your Honor. 25 MR. STEEL: And in terms of scheduling on the

Page 7 affirmative request for stay I do think there is a conflict with the July 30th date, and the first or second week of August may be more appropriate given peoples' schedules, if the Court is available. THE COURT: Okay. And I take it, Mr. Steel, you're comfortable, as I would be, unless you have an objection, with Mr. Martorana simply having made you the assurance on the record that the GUC Trust is voluntarily going to refrain from making distributions during this period of time? MR. STEEL: Yes, Your Honor, we're comfortable with his word. THE COURT: Okay. And I'm comfortable as well. Anybody else want to be heard? Mr. Martorana? MR. MARTORANA: And just to be clear, Your Honor, we will contact your chambers to work on a further adjourned date, but we do want to be back here as soon as possible, because we do want resolution to this issue and the GUC Trust does want to be free to make distributions at some point in the future. So we'll --THE COURT: And you're talking about what I'd call, for lack of a better word, a Phase II. Phase I is liquidating the securities and converting them to cash and accomplishing your tax event, if

that's not the improper word.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. MARTORANA: Correct. No, that we're hoping to get relief on today.

THE COURT: Which I will grant you today given the resolution.

And then you're working on Phase II, which would be something that would permit you to get distributions out to your creditors but which is a matter of greater concern to the tort plaintiff community.

MR. MARTORANA: I think that's right.

To be clear, Your Honor, during this 30 plus day period the idea is to hopefully work towards a more global resolution of the entire appeal process with respect to GUC Trust assets. If we cannot reach a resolution during that time, and it's possible that if we come up with a framework that works we may be, you know, seeking to file a motion for a settlement in that respect and further adjourning what is currently scheduled for July 30th. If we can't, if none of that works out what we want to do is come back on the papers that have already been filed by the plaintiffs and the reply by the GUC Trust to just deal with the issue of a stay pending appeal, and we'd like to be able to present at that time why we don't think a stay pending appeal is appropriate, assuming that we can't reach a more global resolution.

THE COURT: Okay. Fair enough.

Page 9 Now you mentioned the appeal, Mr. Martorana, I know you and Ms. Rubin have some stake in this appeal. I have the benefit of having Mr. Steinberg and Mr. Weisfelner and Mr. Weintraub here. Your motion is granted under the terms that you propose, Mr. Martorana. I'm going leave et to you and the others to ascertain how it's best papered and if they can lead to have express reservation of rights in it that's fine with me. While I have everybody here I would just like to get an update of where things stand on the appeal in terms of a motion for leave for appeal before the circuit, which I think is required, but I haven't seen yet, and/or any other filings or whatever. I don't know if you're the best guy to tell me that, Mr. Martorana, I see you have your colleague, Ms. Rubin, here, I see Mr. Weisfelner behind you, we have the whole array of the usual suspects. So come on up for a second and give me an update guys. MR. MARTORANA: Could I just ask one clarification, Your Honor, before we move on to that?

THE COURT: Of course.

MR. MARTORANA: We submitted an order, and in fact we submitted a revised proposed order which does -- on a substantive level does really nothing more than enhance the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 | flexibility in the sale process for the GUC Trust.

My question is obviously we'd like to get that entered as soon as possible. Would it be okay if we submitted that order and then if others feel strongly about how we deal with the adjournment we could put that on a separate order? Is that -- would that work?

THE COURT: I want to be sure that I understand what you're asking me to do.

You had originally asked for leave to liquidate your securities, which by reason of the narrowness of that request I had always regarded that as a no-brainer. As I expected the plaintiffs said, well we don't care about your liquidating the securities but we do care about you distributing the proceeds of that securities and we want reservations of rights in the deal that you just announced to me.

MR. MARTORANA: Right.

THE COURT: Now the first half is that what you're talking about in this proposed order?

MR. MARTORANA: That's correct. The proposed order, and I'll let others speak if they think differently, but the proposed order addresses nothing other than the authority to liquidate the securities.

THE COURT: Okay. Then I want to invite

Mr. Weisfelner or Mr. Steel and Mr. Weintraub to say whether

Page 11 1 if I give you -- so order the record to say you got full 2 reservation of rights with respect to distributions does 3 that skin the cat or do you want Mr. Martorana's order modified to say that in baby talk in writing? 4 5 MR. WEISFELNER: Your Honor, I can't imagine that 6 we care. 7 THE COURT: Okay. MR. WEISFELNER: If he wants the order entered the 8 9 way he wants the order entered so long as the record is so 10 ordered and based on his representations we don't have an 11 issue. 12 THE COURT: Okay. Does that meet your needs, 13 Mr. Martorana? 14 MR. MARTORANA: Yes, it does, Your Honor. 15 THE COURT: Okay, good. I'm so ordering the 16 record. You guys got a full reservation of rights on 17 distributions. 18 MR. MARTORANA: Thank you, Your Honor. THE COURT: And I also have your earlier assurance 19 20 that you gave me on the order as well, Mr. Martorana. 21 MR. MARTORANA: That's right, Your Honor. 22 THE COURT: Okay, fair enough. 23 So now I'd like to get an update on the appeal, and while we're at it on the state of the briefing on the 24 25 appellate motion and anything else that I may need to deal

Page 12 1 with. 2 MR. WEISFELNER: Your Honor, I think the catch 3 word is a state of confusion, and let me try and unpack that. 4 5 There were any number of notices of appeal filed 6 with respect to Your Honor's April 15th decision and 7 subsequent judgment. To the best of my recollection those notices of appeal were filed on behalf of our plaintiffs, 8 9 Mr. Weintraub's plaintiffs, the Groman (ph) plaintiffs, the 10 GUC, trust, and unitholders, and New GM. 11 In addition we had a notice of appeal filed by Mr. Peller (ph) on behalf of -- I can't remember which of 12 his three or four different clients. 13 14 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Elliott and Susick (ph). MR. WEISFELNER: Elliott and Susick. 15 16 Thereafter there was a motion for reconsideration 17 filed by Mr. Peller on behalf of other of his clients. 18 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Bledsoe (ph). MR. WEISFELNER: Bledsoe, thanks. 19 20 And as far as we all read the rules the filing of 21 the --22 THE COURT: This being 8006(g)? MR. WEISFELNER: Correct. And I think everyone 23 here shares the same opinion that the filing of the motion 24 25 for reconsideration in effect puts all of the appellate

process into, for lack of a better term, a (indiscernible), and that all the appellate procedures are, for lack of a better term, frozen until such time as the motion for reconsideration is resolved since there is no final order.

Nevertheless, Mr. Peller sought to apply to the second circuit to petition the second circuit. I'm not even sure what his petition requests, because on the one hand he talks about a direct appeal to the second circuit, I think he goes so far as the cite to some of Your Honor's determinations in the decision or judgment with regard to the necessity or propriety of going to the second circuit, but then at the end of his petition Mr. Peller indicates that he has no objection to the matter going to the district court in the first instance.

I think Your Honor knows that -- and as a consequence I know that we have filed a motion to intervene in Mr. Peller's petition, which we understood procedurally was required were we to desire as we did to comment on the petition before the second circuit. I believe our intervention has been successful or is at least pending.

As --

THE COURT: Is that -- pause please,

Mr. Weisfelner. Is that considered to be a separate motion
that the circuit has to decide to grant or deny leave to
intervene so you can then be heard on his motion for leave

Pq 14 of 22 Page 14 1 to appeal? 2 MR. WEISFELNER: I believe that's correct, Your 3 Honor. THE COURT: Continue. 4 5 MR. WEISFELNER: And then we've also substantively 6 responded to the petition, even though it doesn't 7 affirmatively stake out a position on where the appeal ought to go to as between the second circuit and the district 8 9 court. We've indicated our views respectfully that 10 notwithstanding Your Honor's certification that we believe 11 the matter is more appropriately addressed in the first 12 instance by the district court. 13 Other than that I believe that New GM as of Monday 14 likewise threw in on the petition, Mr. Steinberg will tell 15 you the procedural posture of New GM's position, but I think 16 as a matter of substance New GM has indicated that it 17 believes that the appellate process ought to proceed in the first instance before the second circuit. 18 19 There are any number of no strike, no objection 20 GUC Trust related pleadings that have been filed by various 21 of the plaintiffs, including us, following the procedures 22 outlined in the judgment, and by virtue of an omnibus

23

24

Judge Furman I believe by virtue of assignment.

So, I think, Your Honor, what the parties are in effect are waiting for is a resolution of the motion for reconsideration.

THE COURT: And at such time as that motion were decided would that until the knot in many or all respects?

MR. WEISFELNER: We believe so.

THE COURT: All right. Let me get other people to comment and tell me whether they have any problems with what you said or they want to supplement it. Mr. Steinberg.

MR. STEINBERG: Your Honor, I essentially agree with what Mr. Weisfelner has said, but I do want to add a couple other things.

One is that I think Mr. Peller was as clear as sometimes he is, but by petitioning the second circuit for a direct appeal he had stated that that was his preferred relief, and that's what he had done.

The response on the Bledsoe pleadings, which are the pleadings for reconsideration, are due a week from this coming Friday, and so we will be responding to that reconsideration motion. I don't know if there's a reply, but then Your Honor will have it in front of you.

THE COURT: Did you stipulate to a right to reply?

Because motions for reconsideration don't even require a

response by the guy in your position unless the court

Pq 16 of 22 Page 16 1 otherwise orders. 2 MR. STEINBERG: Yeah. We did not stipulate for a reply. There is already a draft of the reply, which we'll 3 be filing on a timely basis. I do think that --4 5 THE COURT: Well, I was saying that Peller's reply 6 to what you submit. 7 MR. STEINBERG: I'm sorry. We did not stipulate to Peller's reply, we will be doing a response that will be 8 9 filed on Friday. 10 THE COURT: Which is still a week from Friday. 11 MR. STEINBERG: That's correct. 12 THE COURT: Okay. 13 MR. STEINBERG: The other thing, Your Honor, is 14 that I think most sides have filed the designation for the 15 record on appeal and statement of issues on appeal as well, 16 but I do think that when you untie the knot what'll actually 17 happen again is that the notices of appeal and the 18 designations of the record will all happen again, because I 19 think everybody understands the rule to be that once all the 20 argument positions have been solidified and there is actually a judgment for the second circuit to consider 21 22 that's the real time when people should have been filing the 23 notice of appeal, the designation for the record on appeal, 24 and the certification. And maybe the parties will agree to

accelerate that process because they've already done the

Page 17 1 work, and if Your Honor doesn't touch your decision then I 2 think no one has a changed position on it. But there is 3 that lag because that -- Mr. Peller's position required the 4 restart and the same time periods again. 5 I will note just to -- the Bledsoe plaintiffs, 6 which are the people who move to reargue, include the 7 Elliotts for a different car. So Mr. Peller in this case, 8 just like --9 THE COURT: What there are two cars? 10 MR. STEINBERG: They had two cars. 11 THE COURT: All right. 12 MR. STEINBERG: So the Elliotts have appealed 13 directly to the second circuit with respect to one car and 14 move to reargue with respect to a different car. 15 THE COURT: Uh-huh. Okay. 16 MR. STEINBERG: And we'll try to explain why we 17 think that happened when we file our reply papers. 18 THE COURT: Okay. Ms. Rubin, I gather you have a 19 protective cross-appeal? 20 MS. RUBIN: Yes, Your Honor. If I may be heard 21 briefly? 22 THE COURT: Yes. MS. RUBIN: Your Honor, just to clarify, you had 23 24 mentioned earlier the rule that you felt governed the state 25 appellate proceedings while Mr. Peller's motion was pending.

I understand that's Rule 8002(e), because his motion to amend the judgment is one of the contemplated motions in that rule.

In terms of the recitation of the history that Mr. Weisfelner and Mr. Steinberg have given you I have no disagreement with that other than to add a couple of additional items.

Tomorrow the GUC Trust and the unitholders will be filing their own cross-petition to the second circuit for direct appeal to the second circuit. We will largely echo the points made by Mr. Steinberg and New GM in their petition but add some additional points.

You are correct to say that our appeal is a conditional cross-appeal. In the event that the equitable mootness holding is disturbed, vacated, or reversed in any way we have a number of issues that we have indicated in our statements of issues on appeal, which was filed Monday, that we would like to have the circuit hear.

The final thing that I would say is that there are two motions to withdraw the reference to Your Honor right now. One implicates only the California and Arizona actions, known in the judgment as the state actions. The GUC Trust is obviously not a party to that.

With respect to what Mr. Weisfelner called the omnibus motion to withdraw the reference on the other hand

Pg 19 of 22 Page 19

> the GUC Trust asset pleadings are implicated in that and the GUC Trust will want to be heard on that as well.

We've been having conversations with Mr. Weisfelner and his team about extending our time to respond to that motion to withdraw the reference before Judge Furman.

THE COURT: Okay. Anybody have anything further to add?

MR. STEINBERG: I do, Your Honor.

Your Honor, you had indicated to us that you'd like to be periodically updated as to what is going on in other courts that may impact what you're doing as well too, so we will be filing tomorrow some of the letters that have been exchanged and sent out last night to Judge Furman relating to briefing issues where there's an ensuing battle as to who will hear what issues between Your Honor and Judge Furman. So you'll have the full picture of that.

THE COURT: That's helpful, Mr. Steinberg. As a point of the personal privilege one other thing.

I think I observed everything as Mr. Weisfelner and you and Ms. Rubin were explaining it to me, but if you can confirm what you stated to me by weaving it into that letter, to the extent it's not already there, that would be helpful to me. And since I assume Jesse Furman is copied on these letters I think it'll help him as well.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Page 20 1 MR. STEINBERG: So we will do -- we will follow 2 the process of whatever letter we're drafting we will 3 coordinate with the people all here today so they can sign 4 off on the letter. So this will be a joint letter. 5 THE COURT: I assume it'll be merely repeating 6 what I heard from Mr. Weisfelner and you and Ms. Rubin, but 7 it'll give you a chance to satisfy yourselves that 8 everything you wanted to convey did get conveyed when I 9 didn't give you advanced notice that I'd be asking you this 10 and would also lay it out for both his benefit and mine so 11 we have something to look at very easily to understand 12 what's happening and when. 13 MR. STEINBERG: Sure. Thank you, Your Honor. 14 THE COURT: Thank you. 15 Okay. Anybody else, anything? 16 All right, thank you very much, folks, have a 17 good day. 18 (Whereupon these proceedings were concluded at 10:40 19 AM) 20 21 22 23 24 25

	Py 21 01 22
	Page 21
1	INDEX
2	
3	RULINGS
4	PAGE
5	Motion Filed by Wilmington Trust Company, as GUC
6	Trust Administrator and Trustee, for an Order
7	Granting Authority (A) to Exercise New GM Warrants
8	and Liquidate New GM Common Stock, and (B) to Make
9	Corresponding Amendments to The GUC Trust Agreement 9, 11
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

Page 22 1 CERTIFICATION 2 3 I, Dawn South, certify that the foregoing transcript is a 4 true and accurate record of the proceedings. Digitally signed by Dawn South Dawn South DN: cn=Dawn South, o, ou, email=digital1@veritext.com, c=US 5 Date: 2015.07.07 14:55:25 -04'00' 6 7 Dawn South AAERT Certified Electronic Transcriber CET**D-408 8 9 10 11 12 Date: July 7, 2015 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 Veritext Legal Solutions 23 330 Old Country Road 24 Suite 300 25 Mineola, NY 11501